

# 2018 Current Fiscal Year Report: National Cooperative Geologic Mapping Program

Report Run Date: 06/05/2019 05:44:41 PM

## 1. Department or Agency

Department of the Interior

## 2. Fiscal Year

2018

## 3. Committee or Subcommittee

National Cooperative Geologic Mapping Program

## 3b. GSA Committee No.

245

## 4. Is this New During Fiscal Year?

No

## 5. Current Charter

11/24/2017

## 6. Expected Renewal Date

11/24/2019

## 7. Expected Term Date

## 8a. Was Terminated During Fiscal Year?

No

## 8b. Specific Termination Authority

## 8c. Actual Term Date

## 9. Agency Recommendation for Next Fiscal Year

Continue

## 10a. Legislation Req to Terminate?

Not Applicable

## 10b. Legislation Pending?

Not Applicable

## 11. Establishment Authority Statutory (Congress Created)

## 12. Specific Establishment Authority

43 U.S.C. 31a-h (Sec. 5, PL 102-285, 106 Stat. 166, 169, 5/18/92)

## 13. Effective Date

02/08/1993

## 14. Committee Type

Continuing

## 14c. Presidential?

No

## 15. Description of Committee Scientific Technical Program Advisory Board

## 16a. Total Number of Reports

No Reports for this Fiscal Year

## 17a. Open 1 17b. Closed 0 17c. Partially Closed 0 Other Activities 0 17d. Total 1 Meetings and Dates

Purpose	Start	End
The NCGMP and NGGDPP Federal Advisory Committee will meet to hear updates on progress of the NCGMP towards fulfilling the purposes of the National Geologic Mapping Act of 1992, as well as updates on the NGGDPP towards fulfilling the purposes of the Energy Policy Act of 2005. The Committee, comprised of representatives from Federal agencies, State agencies, academic institutions, and private companies, shall advise the Director of the U.S. Geological Survey on planning and implementation of the geologic mapping and data preservation programs.	05/01/2018	05/02/2018

## Number of Committee Meetings Listed: 1

	Current FY	Next FY
18a(1). Personnel Pmts to Non-Federal Members	\$0.00	\$0.00
18a(2). Personnel Pmts to Federal Members	\$6,692.31	\$7,000.00
18a(3). Personnel Pmts to Federal Staff	\$14,558.00	\$20,000.00
18a(4). Personnel Pmts to Non-Member Consultants	\$0.00	\$0.00
18b(1). Travel and Per Diem to Non-Federal Members	\$5,939.75	\$7,000.00
18b(2). Travel and Per Diem to Federal Members	\$1,670.89	\$8,000.00

<b>18b(3). Travel and Per Diem to Federal Staff</b>	\$1,814.86	\$6,000.00
<b>18b(4). Travel and Per Diem to Non-member Consultants</b>	\$0.00	\$0.00
<b>18c. Other(rents,user charges, graphics, printing, mail, etc.)</b>	\$0.00	\$0.00
<b>18d. Total</b>	\$30,675.81	\$48,000.00
<b>19. Federal Staff Support Years (FTE)</b>	0.15	0.15

**20a. How does the Committee accomplish its purpose?**

The Federal Advisory Committee for the National Cooperative Geologic Mapping Program meets to evaluate progress made towards fulfilling the Federal, State, and Educational components of the National Geologic Mapping Act (NGMA) as well as an evaluation of the progress of the National Geological and Geophysical Data Preservation Program (NGGDPP) as established by the NGGDPP Act of 2005 (Public Law 109–58).

**20b. How does the Committee balance its membership?**

The committee consists of the following: two USGS ex officio members (Chair/Vice Chair), four Federal ex-officio members, two State representatives, two private-sector representatives, and one academic representative, which is mandated by its law.

**20c. How frequent and relevant are the Committee Meetings?**

The committee meets at least annually. The Chair may call other meetings of the Advisory Committee as deemed appropriate. Meetings are called to improve coordination among Federal, State, academic, and private sector institutions involved in geologic mapping and the earth sciences.

**20d. Why can't the advice or information this committee provides be obtained elsewhere?**

No other organization or group exists that provides the breadth of Federal, State, private-sector, and academic membership.

**20e. Why is it necessary to close and/or partially closed committee meetings?**

All meetings of the Advisory Committee are open unless otherwise specified.

**21. Remarks**

Extensive progress has been made in FY18 in accordance with these recommendations. The NCGMP/NGGDPP FAC met in May 2018 to discuss progress towards the NGGDPP 5-year plan, as well as progress on the NCGMP Strategic Implementation Plan, adoption of GeMS (a common geologic map data schema), responding to the 3DEEP initiative, updates on STATEMAP and EDMAP, updates on the annual Geologic Mapping Forum, and ongoing outreach efforts. 43 U.S.C. 31a-h (Sec. 5, PL 102-285, 106 Stat. 166, 169,

5/18/92) The National Geologic Mapping Act was reauthorized in March 2009 in Section 11001 of the Omnibus Public Land Management Act of 2009 (P.L. 111-11) and the National Geological and Geophysical Data Preservation Program (NGGDPP) as established by the NGGDPP Act of 2005 (Public Law 109–58).

## Designated Federal Officer

John Brock NCGMP Program Coordinator

Committee Members	Start	End	Occupation	Member Designation
Brock, John	10/04/2009	10/04/2018	Program Coordinator, USGS, Designated Federal Officer	Regular Government Employee (RGE) Member
Gallagher, Kevin	10/01/2010	10/04/2018	Associate Director for Core Science Systems, Chair	Regular Government Employee (RGE) Member
Johnson, Aaron	01/18/2017	01/18/2022	Private Sector - Director, AIPG	Representative Member
Rogers, Mark	05/27/2016	05/27/2021	Professional Geologist / Consultant	Representative Member
Schmitt, James	01/18/2017	01/18/2022	Professor	Representative Member
Thorleifson, Leonard	01/18/2017	01/18/2022	Minnesota State Geologist	Representative Member
Wunsch, David	12/19/2013	12/19/2018	Director, Delaware Geological Survey	Representative Member

**Number of Committee Members Listed: 7**

## Narrative Description

The Committee shall: Periodically review and critique the implementation plan prepared by the Secretary, acting through the Director of the U.S. Geological Survey (USGS) for the National Cooperative Geologic Mapping Program and the National Geological and Geophysical Data Preservation Program; review the scientific progress of the programs; and submit an annual report to the Secretary that evaluates the progress of the Federal, State, and University geologic mapping activities and evaluates the progress made toward fulfilling the purposes of the Act as well as an evaluation of the progress of the National Geological and Geophysical Data Preservation Program (NGGDPP) as established by the NGGDPP Act of 2005 (Public Law 109–58).

## What are the most significant program outcomes associated with this committee?

Checked if Applies

Improvements to health or safety	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Trust in government	<input type="checkbox"/>
Major policy changes	<input type="checkbox"/>
Advance in scientific research	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Effective grant making	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Improved service delivery	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Increased customer satisfaction	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Implementation of laws or regulatory requirements	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Other

☐

### Outcome Comments

NA

### What are the cost savings associated with this committee?

Checked if Applies

None

☐

Unable to Determine

☒

Under \$100,000

☐

\$100,000 - \$500,000

☐

\$500,001 - \$1,000,000

☐

\$1,000,001 - \$5,000,000

☐

\$5,000,001 - \$10,000,000

☐

Over \$10,000,000

☐

Cost Savings Other

☐

### Cost Savings Comments

NA

### What is the approximate Number of recommendations produced by this committee for the life of the committee?

108

### Number of Recommendations Comments

As of the previous year, the NCGMP/NGGDPP Federal Advisory Committee had conveyed 98 recommendations to the decision maker (Chair) of the committee. At the FY18 Annual Meeting, the Committee made an additional 10 recommendations: NCGMP Recommendations: 1. The NGGDPP should work toward demonstrating programmatic value to state agencies, users, to the scientific community at large. Explore new ways to demonstrate this through qualitative and quantitative means. 2. NCGMP and NGGDPP should consider undertaking a joint needs/benefits study to explore the return on investment for both programs. 3. The NGGDPP should dedicate some resources toward developing a strategy on national comprehensive databases of public geoscience data; look at national groundwater modeling network as an example of a focused, topical national-scale product that would resonate with stakeholders. 4. Consider another nationwide Data Preservation inventory; similar to the assessment that was done in 2007. 5. NCGMP should begin taking first steps (the beginning of a 3-5 year process) to implement the GeMS common data schema, ultimately requiring for all STATEMAP

deliverables down the road. Approach for adoption in STATEMAP should be gradual/phased and include resources for training in support of this transition. Consider for FEDMAP and EDMAP as well. Consider requiring for EDMAP in the very near term.6. Develop a status map to display a composite score depicting the available geologic data in a given area across the United States.7. Recommend USGS and AASG continue to work together on the annual Geologic Mapping Forum. Consider holding again in 2019 to continue the momentum from the inaugural session, but hold every other year going forward. Recommend offering Professional Development Hours (toward P.G. certification) for attendees. AIPG can assist.8. Recommend NCGMP work with AIPG on a column in The Professional Geologist (AIPG quarterly publication) detailing the status of geologic mapping in the United States. This could be the first step in justifying a larger study; step one - lay the groundwork with a column in TPG; step 2 - AIPG leadership follows on the column with a white paper on two themes (what the critical benefit is to the U.S., and what's the status of mapping right now); step 3 - this white paper becomes the basis for a push to do a nationwide study.9. NCGMP should develop a map depicting where funds are invested each year; this map should be widely distributed.10. NCGMP should develop clear guidance, and receive AASG concurrence, regarding STATEMAP funding for derivative products.

**What is the approximate Percentage of these recommendations that have been or will be Fully implemented by the agency?**

75%

**% of Recommendations Fully Implemented Comments**

Not Applicable

**What is the approximate Percentage of these recommendations that have been or will be Partially implemented by the agency?**

25%

**% of Recommendations Partially Implemented Comments**

Not Applicable

**Does the agency provide the committee with feedback regarding actions taken to implement recommendations or advice offered?**

Yes ☒ No ☐ Not Applicable ☐

**Agency Feedback Comments**

Feedback is provided at the next annual committee meeting.

**What other actions has the agency taken as a result of the committee's advice or recommendation?**

Checked if Applies

Reorganized Priorities	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Reallocated resources	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Issued new regulation	<input type="checkbox"/>
Proposed legislation	<input type="checkbox"/>
Approved grants or other payments	<input type="checkbox"/>
Other	<input type="checkbox"/>

**Action Comments**

The agency (USGS) has no regulatory or legislative components.

**Is the Committee engaged in the review of applications for grants?**

No

**Grant Review Comments**

NA

**How is access provided to the information for the Committee's documentation?**

Checked if Applies

Contact DFO	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Online Agency Web Site	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Online Committee Web Site	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Online GSA FACA Web Site	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Publications	<input type="checkbox"/>
Other	<input type="checkbox"/>

**Access Comments**

NA